

## LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 1st April, 1987

No. 9/3/87-6Lab./1615.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of Xen, Operation, H.S.E.B., Rewari.—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI A. S. CHALIA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 283 of 1985

between

SHRI RAM AVTAR, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT MANAGEMENT OF M/S  
SECRETARY, H. S. E. B., CHANDIGARH; (II) XEN, OPERATION, H.S.E.B. REWARI

Present :—

Shri S. K. Goswami, for the workman.

Shri V.P. Sharma, for the respondent management.

## AWARD

This reference under section 10 (1) (c) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 Act No. 14 of 1947), as amended from time to time and latest by Act No. 49 of 1934 (hereinafter referred as the said Act) was made to this Court by the State of Haryana (Department of Labour),—vide its endorsement No. ID/GGN/4-85/19391-97, dated 30th April, 1985, to adjudicate upon the dispute of service matter covered by Second Schedule under section 7 of the said Act, arisen between Shri Ram Avtar, workman and the respondent management of (i) Secretary, H.S. E. B., Chandigarh; (ii) Xen, Operation, H. S.E.B., Rewari. Accordingly, it has been registered as reference No. 283 of 1985.

2. Ram Avtar has claimed that he was appointed on 1st October, 1980 and his services were terminated on 1st August, 1984, though he had acquired the status of a regular employee as having worked continuously for more than 240 days. It has been alleged that order of termination is illegal, mala fide and in violation of principles of natural justice. Accordingly request has been made to reinstate him into his job with full back wages and further with continuity of service.

3. On notice, respondent filed written statement and contested the reference. It has been pointed out that he was engaged as a daily wages worker and was paid off in July, 1984. Further claim is that his services were terminated on the basis of complaint against him and after holding enquiry in to the allegations. He had submitted his replication, repeated his claim as well as allegations.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, my learned predecessor had framed the following issues on 6th September, 1985 :—

(1) As per Reference ?

5. From the side of respondent Arjun Dev. Junior Engineer, Krishan Lal, A.F.M., Ruran Singh, Dhalia, S. D.O., have been examined. On the other hand there are statement of Babu Singh, U.D. C. and Ram Avtar, workman, also.

6. I have heard the parties as represented above. My finding has been as follow :—

Issue No. I:—

The services of Ram Avtar were terminated,—vide order dated 1st August, 1984, Ex. M-6 by the Xen (Operation) Rewari. The said order speaks as follows:—  
To

Shri Ram Avtar, Casual Labour, C/O SDO, Co. St. S/Division, Rewari.

Subject.—Termination of services.

- Since your work and conduct during the stay in the Const. S/Divn., HSEB, Rewari, has not been found satisfactory as such your services are hereby terminated w.e.f. 1st August, 1984.

It has been contended by Shri Goswami that this order on the face of it is nullity and must be quashed. On the other hand, Shri Sharma has replied that the said order is valid one and he has relief upon 1985-II Service Law Reporter Page 356 Ramesh Kumar vs. H.S.E.B. that case was of a Meter Reader of H.S.E.B. and his services were terminated after passing the following order:—

“The services of Shri Ramesh Kumar, Meter Reader attached with Gurgaon Division who was placed under suspension,—*vide* Xen, Gurgaon O.O. No. 318, dated 2nd November, 1982, are hereby terminated with immediate effect.”

On comparison the impugned order in the present case is in soft language while termination order in the case of Ramesh Kumar was passed after placing him under suspension. In both the cases no regular enquiry was held against the employee. In that case there were allegations of beating as well as removal of money from the table while in the case in hand there were allegations of misbehaviour and disobedience also and as such I am not in a position to make a distinction in between the two cases. I am afraid that no deviation can be done from the case of Ramesh Kumar referred above since that decision is dated 29th August, 1984. On the face of it order of termination hardly requires any interference and as such reference is answered against the workman.

A. S. CHALIA,

Dated the 5th February, 1987.

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 242, dated the 24th February, 1987.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

A. S. CHALIA,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Faridabad.

The 6th May, 1987

No. 9/1/87-Lab./2554.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala, in respect of the dispute between the Workman and the management of Haryana Urban Development Authority, Karnal.—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI V.P. CHAUDHARY PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
AMBALA

Reference No. 128 of 1986

SHRI DHOOP SINGH, SON OF SHRI JUG LAL, VILLAGE VIRACHPUR, P. O. BIJNA,  
DIST. KARNAL, AND THE MANAGEMENT OF THE M/S HARYANA URBAN  
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, KARNAL

Present: —

Shri D. P. Pathak, for workman.

None for respondent.

#### AWARD

The Hon'ble Governor of Haryana in the exercise of its powers conferred, —*vide* clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred dispute between Shri Dhoop Singh and management of the M/s H.U.D.A., Karnal, to this Court. The terms of the reference are as under:—

“Whether termination of services of Shri Dhoop Singh is just and correct, if not, to what relief is he entitled?”

Workman through his demand notice dated 20th August, 1985 alleged that he joined service of respondent management as a Sweeper in February, 1982 through Employment Exchange. He had been in the service of Haryana Urban Development Authority up to 20th January, 1984, thereafter, he was transferred to Municipal Committee, Karnal. Municipal Committee, Karnal provided work up to 6th August, 1985. Thereafter no work was provided by the Municipal Committee, Karnal to him. Workman approached the respondent again to provide him some work, but the respondent declined to give him any job. He has come to know from the reliable sources that some new Sweeper has been employed in his place. So he alleged that his termination without issuing any notice and without making payment of any retrenchment compensation is violative to the provisions of section 25 (F) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. He prayed for his reinstatement with continuity in service and with full back wages.

Respondent management was served. It appeared. The reference was fixed for filing of reply for 11th December, 1986, but on that day respondent absented. *Ex parte* proceedings were taken up against it. In *ex parte* proceedings Shri Dhoop Singh examined himself. He stated that he joined service of respondent management on 19th January, 1982 as a Sweeper through Employment Exchange. He worked in the service of respondent from 10th April, 1982 to 6th July, 1985. On 7th July, 1985 he was removed from service without issuing any notice and without making payment of retrenchment compensation. He further stated that sweepers of Karnal formed an union. He joined that union. Due to that fact his services were terminated by the respondent management.

In view of the above evidence I am of the considered opinion that respondent management voluntarily withdrew from the contest of the dispute. From the statement of workman it is established that he remained in the service of respondent management more than 240 days. On 7th July, 1985 his services were terminated without issuing any notice and without making payment of retrenchment compensation. This shows that respondent management has violated the provisions of section 25 (F) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 while terminating the services of the workman a new sweeper has been employed in his place. So this shows that the termination order regarding the services of the workman is illegal and unjust. I order that workman be reinstated with continuity in service and with full back wages. I pass award regarding the dispute in hand accordingly.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Ambala.

Dated the 4th February, 1987.

Endorsement No. 306, dated 10th February, 1987

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Ambala.

No. 9/1/87-6Lab./2559.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala, in respect of the dispute between the Workman and the Management of (i) Secretary, Haryana State Electricity Board, Chandigarh, (ii) The Chairman, Haryana State Electricity Board, Smalkha, (iii) Executive Engineer, Sub-Urban Division H. S. E. B., Panipat.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI V. P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
AMBALA

Reference No. 123 of 1985

SHRI DHARAM BIR S/O SHRI GOPI RAM, VILLAGE JORASI, TEHSIL PANIPAT AND  
THE MANAGEMENT OF THE SECRETARY, HARYANA STATE ELECTRICITY  
BOARD, CHANDIGARH, (II) THE CHAIRMAN, HARYANA STATE ELECTRICITY  
BOARD, SMALKHA, (III) EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, SUB-URBAN DIVISION H.S.E.B.,  
PANIPAT

Present :

None for workman.

Shri Narinder Paul Singh for respondent.

## AWARD

The Hon'ble Governor of Haryana in the exercise of its powers conferred,—*vide* clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred dispute between Shri Dharam Bir and H.S.E.B. etc. to this Court. The terms of the reference are as under :—

"Whether termination of services of Shri Dharambir workman is justified and correct? If not, to what relief is he entitled?"

Workman through his demand notice alleged that up to 31st January, 1983 he had worked for 872 days. Thereafter his services were terminated. His dispute was got compromised by the Labour Officer, in spite of that he was not given any job. Certain junior to him have been retained in job.

Respondent management contended that the petitioner was working as daily wages labourer at the rate of Rs. 13 per day. Workman absented on 22nd October, 1983, his services were never terminated on 22nd October, 1983. He was asked to join at Jassendh but he did not join any duty there and had been absenting since 24th October, 1983.

On the pleadings of the parties issues were framed. Workman evidence was recorded. The case was fixed for management evidence. Parties reached an amicable settlement. Respondent management has taken the workman in service on duty on old terms and conditions of service with continuity in service without back wages. Since the workman has been taken on duty by the respondent management, the matter has been settled finally. I pass award regarding the dispute in his favour accordingly.

Dated 19th February 1987

V. P. CHAUDHARY,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Ambala.

Enlist. No. 401, Dated 19th February, 1987

Forwarded (four copies) to the Hon'ble Chief Minister and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh for required action under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Ambala.

No. 9/1/87-6Lab./2570.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the Management of The Shahabad Co-operative Sugar Mills, Shahabad (Markanda).

IN THE COURT OF SHRI V. P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
AMBALA

Ref. No. 226 of 1986

between

SHRI GURCHARAN SINGH C/O PT. MADHU SUDAN SARAN, COWSHISH, LATHMARAN  
STREET, JAGADHRI AND THE MANAGEMENT OF THE SHAHABAD  
CO-OPERATIVE SUGAR MILLS, SHAHABAD (MARKANDA)

Present

None for workman  
Shri M. Kant, for respondent

## AWARD

The Hon'ble Governor of Haryana in the exercise of its powers conferred,—*vide* clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred dispute between Shri Gurcharan Singh and Shahabad Co-operative Sugar Mills Ltd., Shahabad (C) to this Court. The terms of the reference are as under :—

"Whether termination of services of Shri Gurcharan Singh is justified and correct? If not, to what relief is he entitled?"

Workman through his statement of claim urged that he had been working in the respondent-management on permanent basis. His services were terminated with effect from 3rd March, 1986 in violation of provisions of sections 25 (F) and 25 (N). He prayed for his reinstatement with continuity in service and with full back wages.

Respondent management was served. It was represented by Shri U. Kant, Authorised Representative. Respondent management filed written statement through it. It contended that applicant has no cause of action because he had been working on daily wages during the crushing season. He received his wages in full and final settlement on 3rd March, 1986 at the end of the crushing season, so demand notice is baseless. Workman was not a permanent employee. He was seasonal labourer. When he had received his full and final payment on the end of the crushing season then there was no necessity of compliance of provisions of section 25 (F) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by the respondent management.

Today neither workman nor his Authorised Representative appeared, so the reference is dismissed in default.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Ambala.

Dated the 24th February, 1987.

Endorsement No. 407, dated the 24th February, 1987

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,

Labour Court, Ambala.

No. 9/1/87-6Lab/2571.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of The Shahabad Co-operative Sugar Mills Ltd., Shahabad Markanda (Kurukshetra).

IN THE COURT OF SHRI V. P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,  
AMBALA

Reference No. 227 of 1986

SHRI ASHWANI KUMAR C/O PT. MADHU SUDAN SARAN COWSHISH, LATHMARAN STREET, JAGADHRI AND THE MANAGEMENT OF THE SHAHABAD CO-OPERATIVE SUGAR MILLS LTD., SHAHABAD MARKANDA (KURUKSHETRA)

Present :

None for the workman.

Shri U. Kant, for respondent.

#### AWARD

The Hon'ble Governor of Haryana in the exercise of its powers conferred,—*vide* clause (C) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred dispute between Shri Ashwani Kumar and The Shahabad Co-operative Sugar Mills Ltd., Shahabad (M) to this Court. The terms of the reference are as under :—

“Whether termination of services of Shri Ashwani Kumar, workman, is justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

Workman through his demand notice alleged that he had been serving the respondent-management on permanent basis. His services were terminated on 5th February, 1986 in utter violation of provisions of section 25 (F) and section 25 (N). He prayed for his reinstatement with continuity in service and with full back wages.

Respondent-management appeared, contested the dispute and contended that the workman has got no cause of action because he had been working on daily wages and he worked in different period on temporary basis. He was not at all in the employment of respondent-management on permanent basis. In fact he was a seasonal labourer. As soon as the crushing season came to an end full and final settlement arrived at between the parties on 5th March, 1986 and according to that all the dues of the workman were paid to him. These material facts have been from the Court, by the workman so it was prayed that there is no unfair Labour practice on the part of respondent-management and there was no necessity of compliance of provisions of section 25 (F). This reference be dismissed.

This reference was fixed for filing written statement for today, but neither workman nor his A. R. appeared, so the reference is dismissed in default.

Dated the 24th February, 1987.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Ambala.

Endst. No. 406, dated the 24th February, 1987

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Ambala.

No. 9/1/87-6Lab./2573.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of (i) Secretary, H.S.E.B., Chandigarh, (ii) Executive Engineer, H.S.E.B., Jind.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI V. P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, AMBALA

Reference No. 235 of 1985

SHRI BHAGWAN, SON OF SHRI DIWAN CHAND, VILLAGE CHANDELA, TEHSIL AND P. O. JIND AND THE MANAGEMENT OF THE SECRETARY, H.S.E.B., CHANDIGARH,  
(II) EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, H.S.E.B., JIND.

Present :

Shri Bhagwan, workman in person.

Shri G. P. Garg, for the respondent.

#### AWARD

The Hon'ble Governor of Haryana in the exercise of its powers conferred,—vide clause (C) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred dispute between Shri Bhagwan and H.S.E.B., etc. to this court. The terms of the reference are as under:—

“Whether termination of services of Shri Bhagwan, workman is justified and correct? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

Workman through his demand notice alleged that he joined service of respondent management on 19th April, 1980 on daily wages. His services were terminated on 28th May, 1984 in violation of provisions of section 25 (F) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The Post on which he used to work that is still lying vacant, so he has prayed for his reinstatement with continuity in service and with full back wages.

Respondent management contested the dispute and contended that the reference is not maintainable. Labour Tribunal has got no jurisdiction to try the present dispute. Reference is time barred. In fact, applicant was a daily wages employee. It was further contended that post of workman is not lying vacant the workman is not entitled to the relief claimed for.

On the pleadings of the parties issues were framed. The reference was posted for evidence of the management. During the pendency of the dispute parties made amicable settlement. Shri G. P. Garg, S.D.O. Sub-urban Division H.S.E.B., Jind made statement that respondent management is willing to take the workman in its employment on old terms and conditions with the relief of continuity in service without back wages. The period of absence shall be treated leave of the kind due. Workman shall be given the original date of seniority.

The above statement of Shri G. P. Garg, SDO accepted by Shri Bhagwan workman, so I hold that as per terms and conditions of the compromise workman shall be taken in job with the relief of continuity in service without back wages. He will be given original seniority and the workman shall join his duty on 24th February, 1987 as agreed by the respondent management. So, I pass award regarding the dispute in hand accordingly.

Dated the 23rd February, 1987.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Ambala.

Endorsement No. 402, dated the 24th February, 1987.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Ambala

No. 9/1/87-6Lab./2930.—In pursuance of the provision of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Ambala in respect of the dispute between the Workman and the Management of M/s (i) Secretary, H. S. E. B. Chandigarh (ii) Executive Engineer 'Op' H. S. E. B. Jagadhri (iii) Chief Engineer, 'Op' H. S. E. B. Sector 17, Chandigarh :—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI V.P. CHAUDHARY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT  
AMBALA.

Ref. No. 234 of 1985

SHRI AVTAR SINGH S/O SHRI PIARA SINGH, C/O DR. SURINDER KUMAR SHARMA INTUC OFFICE, RLY ROAD JAGADHRI AND THE MANAGEMENT OF THE MESSRS SECRETARY, H. S. E. B. CHANDIGARH II (EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, 'OP' H. S. E. B. JAGADHRI (III) CHIEF ENGINEER, 'OP' H. S. E. B. SECTOR-17 CHANDIGARH.

Present.—

Shri Surinder Sharma, for workman.

Shri S. Bindra, for respondent.

#### AWARD

The Hon'ble Governor of Haryana in the exercise of powers conferred,—vide clause (c) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred dispute between Shri Avtar Singh, workman and Messrs H. S. E. B. etc., to this Court. The terms of reference are as under :—

“Whether termination of services of Shri Avtar Singh, workman is justified and correct, if not to what relief is he entitled?”

Workman through his statement of claim alleged that he was employed in the respondent management for the last two years on monthly basis. His services were terminated on 1st January, 1983 in violation of provisions of section 25 (F) (N) of Industrial Dispute Act, 1947. He prayed for his reinstatement with continuity in service and with full back wages.

Respondent management contested the dispute and contended that workman was engaged as a Casual daily rated worker in May, 1981 at the daily wages of Rs. 11 per day. He was neither regular nor confirmed employee. After November, 1982 workman never turned up to resume his duty. so it was alleged that workman abandoned his job of his own and there is no retrenchment Compensation regarding services of workman.

Workman filed replication through which he refuted the contentions of the respondent management.

On the pleadings of the parties issues were framed. Workman concluded his evidence by examining himself.

Thereafter parties reached at an amicable settlement it was agreed upon between the parties workman shall be taken in job by the respondent management with the relief of continuity in service and without back wages. So I pass award regarding the dispute in hand accordingly.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Ambala.

Dated, the 25th March, 1987.

Endst. No. 694, dated the 27th March 1987

Forwarded (four copies), to the Financial Commissioner & Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of I.D. Act, 1947.

V. P. CHAUDHARY,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Ambala.

The 20th May, 1987

No. 9/3/87-6Lab./2509.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act, No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. Neeraj Enterprises, Plot No. 128, Sector 6, Faridabad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI A. S. CHALIA, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, FARIDABAD.

Reference No. 25 of 1987

*between*

SHRI PARAS NATH, WORKMAN AND THE RESPONDENT-MANAGEMENT OF M/S. NEERAJ ENTERPRISES PLOT NO. 128, SECTOR 6, FARIDABAD.

*Present:—*

None, for the workman.

Shri H. S. Kaushik, for the respondent.

#### AWARD

This reference under Section 10 (1) (c) of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. 14 of 1947) as amended from time to time and latest by Act No. 49 of 1984 (hereinafter referred as the said Act) was made to this Court by the State of Haryana (Department of Labour),—*vide* its endorsement No. ID/FD/143-86/797-802, dated 8th January, 1987 to adjudicate upon the dispute of service matter covered by second schedule under Section 7 of the said Act, arisen between Shri Paras Nath, workman and the respondent-management of M/s. Neeraj Enterprises, Plot No. 128, Sector 6, Faridabad. Accordingly, it has been registered as reference No. 25 of 1987.

2. Shri H. S. Kaushik has produced photo copy of payment voucher to the effect that the amount of Rs. 1400 has been paid to the workman towards full and final settlement of the matter in dispute. There is no reason to disbelieve the same, since Paras Nath has not turned up. The reference is accordingly consigned to records.

A. S. CHALIA,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Faridabad.

Dated the 11th March, 1987.

Endst. No. 548, dated the 24th March, 1987.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under Section 15 of Industrial Disputes Act.

A. S. CHALIA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Faridabad.